

10/721,141

**REMARKS**

Claims 47-54 are currently pending in the subject application. In this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 47 and 54. Reconsideration of the application in its current format is hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 47-54 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner states:

"The specification does not appear to explicitly describe the following limitation 'combining the product finder software unit with other software units to form an object-oriented software application. Note the specification does not appear to specifically reference an 'object-oriented' software application or state combining the product finder software with other software units to form an object-oriented software application."

Initially, Applicant generally notes that a specification need not describe the claimed invention *ipsis verbis* (literally) to comply with the written description requirement. *Ex parte Sorenson*, 3 USPQ2d 1462, 1463 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int'l 1987). The test is whether the originally filed specification reasonably conveys to a person having ordinary skill that applicant had possession of the subject matter later claimed. *Id.* With regard to the specific rejection made by the Examiner, Applicant notes that Java is a well known object-oriented software programming language and that software written in Java is object-oriented software. The specification discloses that the product finder software unit and other software are Java-based. Thus, Applicant submits that the specification provides ample support for the recitation of "object-oriented" software. Nonetheless, Applicant has removed this recitation from the claims. With regard to the recitation concerning combining the product finder software unit with other software, Applicant submits that

10/721,141

paragraphs [0003], [00020] and [0025] of the filed specification provide ample support for the recitation.

The Examiner has rejected claims 47-54 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the meaning of the term "forming a searchable store of information" is not clear. The Examiner is unclear whether "forming a searchable store" is equivalent to "creating a search configuration in accordance with the search rules". The undersigned attorney does not really understand this rejection and believes that the terms in question are clear. A searchable store of information is a store of information, like a database, that can be searched. A search configuration is a search scheme or strategy for performing a search, such as on a store of information. In this regard, a search configuration is described in paragraph [00028] of the filed specification. In closing, "forming a searchable store" is not equivalent to "creating a search configuration in accordance with the search rules".

The Examiner has rejected claims 47-54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,922,695 to Skufca et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,714 to Wheeler et al. Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Skufca et al. patent discloses using Java 2 Enterprise Edition (J2EE) to form a three-tiered client architecture 100 for Internet applications. Since the Skufca et al. uses J2EE, the Skufca et al. patent uses Enterprise Java Beans, which are also used in embodiments of the present invention described in the subject application. Skufca et al., however, fails to disclose forming a searchable store of information about specific physical products using a defined product finder software unit that is reusable and

10/721,141

contains product objects, a product manager, a set of metadata rules and a set of search rules. Moreover, the Skufca et al. patent fails to disclose combining such a reusable product finder software unit with other software to form an application. The mere fact that the Skufca et al. patent involves J2EE cannot be construed as disclosing such a combining operation. The Wheeler et al. patent fails to cure these deficiencies of the Skufca et al. patent. Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claim 47 and, thus, dependent claims 48-54 are patentable over Skufca et al. patent and the Wheeler et al. patent.


Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 050877.

Respectfully submitted,

ABB Technology AG

By:



Paul R. Katterle, Reg. No. 36563

December 21, 2007

c/o ABB Inc.  
29801 Euclid Avenue-4U6  
Wickliffe, Ohio 44092-2530  
(440) 585-7968